

Appl. No. 10/646,901

Amdt. Dated September 5, 2006

Reply to Office Action of June 5, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 05 2006

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office action mailed June 5, 2006. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-4, 8-24, and 28-44 remain pending in this application, with Claims 1, 21, 41, and 43 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 21, and 43 have been amended herein. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Before proceeding to the claim objections and rejections delineated in the Office action, Applicant would like to thank Examiner Woods for his courtesy in agreeing to a telephonic interview on even date, and to the courtesies he extended during the interview, including withdrawal of the finality of the above-noted Office action.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claim 43 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description. In response, Applicants respectfully point out that the features encompassed by this claim are fully described and enabled in at least paragraph [0033], which states "the entire edge of the image 204 that includes the image edge point 508 remains aligned with the display area edge 206."

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, first paragraph rejection is respectfully solicited.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 21, and 41-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,407,749 (Duke et al.), Claims 2, 9, 11-19, 22, 29, and 32-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Duke et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,396,507 (Kaizuka et al.), Claims 4, 8, 24, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Duke et al., Kaizuka et al., and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0149605 (Grossman et al.), and Claims 10 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Duke et al., Kaizuka et al., and U.S. Patent Nos. 5,583,984 (Conrad et al.). These rejections

Appl. No. 10/646,901

Amtdt. Dated September 5, 2006

Reply to Office Action of June 5, 2006

are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1 and 21 now more clearly recite that, while zooming, the position of the image edge point is maintained such that the image edge point remains coincident with the display area edge point. Independent Claims 41 and 43 each recite maintaining an alignment of the image points with the display area edge that includes the display area edge point to which the zoom line extends.

Duke et al. has been thoroughly reviewed and while this reference may broadly suggest a straight zoom line that extends through a zoom point, and between a central point and a display area edge, nowhere does it disclose, or even remotely suggest at least the above noted features of independent Claims 1, 21, 41, or 43. Namely, Applicant submits that Duke et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least that the image edge point remains coincident with the display area edge point, and/or maintaining an alignment of the image points with the display area edge that includes the display area edge point to which the zoom line extends.

All of the other applied references have been thoroughly reviewed and none is understood to make up for at least the above-noted deficiencies of independent Claims 1, 21, 41, and 43. As such, none of the claims that depend from these independent claims is believed to be rendered obvious.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claims 1, 21, 41, and 43 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Appl. No. 10/646,901

Amdt. Dated September 5, 2006

Reply to Office Action of June 5, 2006

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 9/5/06

By: 

Paul D. Amrozowicz
Reg. No. 45,264
(480) 385-5060